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Abstract
Purpose: The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of delegation of responsibility on Innovation Performance of DTS in Kenya.

Methodology: This study adopted a descriptive survey design. The sampling frame of this study was derived from the database of the SASRA. Multistage sampling was used to select the sample of the study. The population of the study was the 181 DTS’s operating in Kenya while the target population was 18 DTS’s. The respondents were individual management staff. A questionnaire was used to gather primary data. Secondary data was collected through review of published literature such as journals articles, published theses and textbooks. Information was sorted, coded and input into the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 for production of graphs, tables, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics.

Results: The study found out that delegation of responsibilities and innovation performance are positively and significant related (r=0.081, p=0.017).

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: Following the study results, it was recommended that Deposit Taking Sacco’s in Kenya should involve the employees in decision making without seeking prior approval from the manager. This will make them perceive their managers are valuing their contribution or that the managers are recognizing that they are intelligent, which will can lead to employee satisfaction and subsequently greater productivity.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background of the Study
The world is moving quickly from a production-based economy to an innovation-based economy (Huang, Yi-Chun & Wu 2010). Knowledge storage and application are the basis of economic growth and accumulated capital (Hsu & Fang, 2010). Crossan & Marina Apaydin (2010) define
innovation as production or adoption, assimilation, and exploitation of a value-added novelty in economic and social spheres; renewal and enlargement of products, services, and markets.

Human resource management (HRM) practices have been defined in several aspects. Schuler and Jackson (2002) define HRM practices as a system that attracts, develops, motivate, and retains employees to ensure the effective implementation and the survival of the organization and its members. Besides, HRM practices is also conceptualized as a set of internally consistent policies and practices designed and implemented to ensure that a firm’s human capital contribute to the achievement of its business objectives (Delery & Doty, 2004).

Sanidas (2005) examined the links between SMEs, organizational innovations (OIs), and economic growth across OECD countries with particular reference to Japan and the USA. The study in these two countries revealed that the American economic survival and Japanese protracted economic downturn can be related to the existence of organizational innovation. The relative importance of SMEs in the two countries was only a contingent factor necessary but not sufficient for economic growth.

Many developing countries are recognizing innovation as a major source of modern productivity growth and presently constitute a central process of economic advancement.

In the context of Somalia, telecommunication industry has been considered as one of the most important industry in Somalia’s economy. The industry has full contribution in terms of technological innovation, unemployment reduction, and acting as a source of public contribution to the society. Every telecommunication company attempts to popularize its services, renew its products, and make innovations in order to became well known and gain the major part of the market.

As contended by Küpper, (2001), service innovation strategy has been aimed at highlighting any procedures and strategies in improving and enhancing business in terms of new services or patterns of service. Many telecommunication organizations in Mogadishu brought new services to the market by enhancing their business performance, growth, and innovation strategies to succeed their competitors. However, the focus on Innovation Performance particularly in developing countries is a relatively recent phenomenon.

Kenya has managed to achieve a higher level of competitiveness when compared to other African countries. In the Global Competitiveness Index, Kenya ranked 94 in 2006, one place down from its previous rank of 93 in 2006 (Porter et al, 2006). The country’s competitiveness seems to expand into the micro-economic area, displaying a rank of 68 for 2006 in the Business Competitive Index, five places up from rank 73 that Kenya occupied in 2005 (Porter et al, 2006). Kenya’s technological achievements are far from being realized and it is ranked at 68 out of a total of 72. Not only has the country not managed to branch out into newer technological areas, it has also not managed to diffuse old technology to large parts of its population, reducing with this the potential benefits that country nationals could derive from it (UNDP, 2008).

The SACCO movement in Kenya is reputed as the largest in Africa and among the top 10 globally (Wanyama, 2009). It has over KES 500 Billion in assets and a savings portfolio estimated at KES 378 Billion, the SACCO movement in Kenya constitutes a significant proportion of about 20% of the country’s savings. SACCOs have thus become vital components of Kenya’s economy and social development.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

In the Kenya Vision 2030, Kenya aims at raising savings and investment rates from 17% to 30% and reducing the share of population without access to finance from 85% to 70%. Ahmed and Shepherd, (2010) noted that countries like USA, Japan and some European that continuously innovate contribute significantly to economic growth. Sacco’s plays a critical role in the transformation of economy through mobilization of required savings and offering credit facilities. As part of Kenya Government reform process in the financial sector, SACCO Societies Regulatory Authority (SASRA) was established in 2008 with dual objectives of protecting the interests of Deposit taking Sacco’s (DTS) members, ensuring public confidence in the public towards the Sacco sector and spurring Kenya’s economic growth through the mobilization of domestic savings. However, despite of the increased regulatory reforms undertaken in the Sacco sub - sector in Kenya, performance of DTS’ is still poor.

SASRA statistics show that between 2014 and 2016, the regulator revoked operating licenses of 43 Deposit Taking Sacco’s due to severely undercapitalization, inability to meet members and third parties obligations leading to unsustainably high external borrowing (SASRA 2015; 2016). CBK in a survey conducted in 2013 and 2014 found out that in spite of Sacco’s wide geographical spread in the country, DTS’s lost 12% and 17% respectively of their market share to other financial service providers. This implies that DTS’s are threatened for survival as a competitive enterprise.

Nyaga (2014) avers that many DTS’s are undercapitalized due to their low level of innovativeness. Cheruiyot (2012) found out that in order to gain competitive edge, increase capital, enhance efficiency and meet increasing demand of relatively cheaper loans by the members, DTS’s must embrace innovation; introduce new products and services, adopts new technology, improve business processes and increase operational efficiency. Human Resource (HR) is the most important asset for any organization as source of achieving competitive advantage. The previous innovation literature has been characterized by relatively scant attention being paid to HRM practices and how they influence innovation performance (Laursen and Foss, 2011). Most of the empirically-based literature since the mid-2000s has focused on the effects of complementary HRM practices, rather than the effect of individual HRM practices (Ennen and Richter, 2010).

Notably still, most of the literature reviewed linking HRM practices to innovation performance are drawn from developed countries context like the USA, Europe and Japan and the studies cannot be generalized to Kenya. Although there are other HRM practices that influence innovation performance, this study will focus on delegation of responsibilities This study therefore seeks to establish the influence of delegation of responsibilities on innovation performance of DTS’s in Kenya.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The objective of the study was to examine the influence of delegation of responsibilities on Innovation Performance of DTS in Kenya.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Accountability Theory

Accountability Theory developed by Frink & Klimoski (1998) is described as a contract between an agent and a principal and arises from a duty upon the agent and the rights of the principal. The principal can be entirely passive and this will not matter to the agent whose duty nevertheless is to account - the passive principal is merely waiving his or her rights to the information. Accountability requires an account of the extent to which the objectives for which the resources were entrusted have been achieved.

On the other hand, it has been argued by Tricker (2006) that the agent only has a duty to account to principals who demand information and are willing to enforce the contract. Most of the research on corporate accountability suggests that responsibility is the only way to ensure that companies provide complete and comparable reports. Gray (2009) suggests a compliance with standards approach, and the proliferation of reporting guidelines mainly on environmental issues. Many academics consider that only mandated standardized reporting will produce the comprehensive information needed to assess organization’ performance. Support for such a regulated approach is provided by evidence that voluntary disclosure levels are much lower than those for mandated disclosure.

A more persuasive argument for the use of legislation in making companies more accountable is that social and environmental matters are too complex and crucial to be left entirely in the already over-burdened hands of organizations. Thus, by opening up organizations in order to inform stakeholders, it enables the stakeholders, rather than management of organizations, to express their choices about critical issues. One of the problems associated with reporting against mandatory standards however, is the question of who ensures compliance with those standards and what penalties apply for non-compliance. For implementing agencies it can be argued that accountability should be more focused on accounting for their actions and effects on society, rather than accounting for their financial performance (Bebbington and Gray, 2009).

2.2 Empirical Review

Delegation is a process that involves assigning important tasks to subordinates, giving subordinates responsibility for decisions form ally made by the manager, and increasing the amount of work-related discretion allowed to subordinates, including the authority to make decisions without seeking prior approval from the manager (Yukland Fu, 2009). Elele & Fields (2010) in their study noted that employees most often will have more complete knowledge of their work than even their senior or supervisors. Decisions made in consultation with employees were made with more information.

Employees who are involved in decision making subsequently are better equipped to implement such decisions. Employees may also perceive their managers as valuing their contribution or that the managers are recognizing that employees are intelligent. This can lead to employee satisfaction and subsequently greater productivity. According to Leanna (2006) , delegation differs from other decision making processes, such as participation (or consultation) in two main ways; delegation involves decision making by an individual subordinate rather than by a group of subordinates or
by a supervisor-subordinate dyad; and delegation emphasizes subordinates autonomy in making decisions (Locke and Schweiger, 2009; Leanna, 2006).

Graen and Uhl-Bien (2005) studied the role of delegation on innovation. In their study found out that managers that delegate responsibilities are likely able to foster the formation of high quality relationship with their subordinates. This relationship in turn leads to subordinates experiencing trust and respect and are likely to reciprocate by strengthening and encouraging the superior. As such, delegation can be viewed as a mechanism that builds and nourishes superior-subordinate relationships. Delegated responsibility sends signals of trust and competence (Leanna, 2006) to the subordinate contributing to the social bonding.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive survey design. The sampling frame of this study was derived from the database of the SASRA. Multistage sampling was used to select the sample of the study. The population of the study was the 181 DTS’s operating in Kenya while the target population was 18 DTS’s. The respondents were individual management staff. A questionnaire was used to gather primary data. Secondary data was collected through review of published literature such as journals articles, published theses and textbooks. Information was sorted, coded and input into the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 for production of graphs, tables, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Response Rate

The number of questionnaires that were administered was 308 and a total of 296 questionnaires were properly filled and returned where as some of the respondents returned the questionnaires half-filled others refused to return them completely despite a lot of follow up. The response rate result is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>96.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rate was 96.10% as shown on Table 1 This represented an overall success according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) and also Kothari (2004) a response rate of above 50% is adequate for a descriptive study. Cooper and Schindler (2003) also argues that a response rate exceeding 30% of the total sample size provides enough data that can be used to generalize the characteristics of a study problem as expressed by the opinions of few respondents in the target population. Based on these assertions the response rate of 96.10% was adequate for the study.
4.2 Demographic Characteristics

This section consists of information that describes basic characteristics such as gender of the respondent, age, level of education job position and number of years worked.

4.2.1 Gender of the respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. Figure 1 shows the results.

![Gender of the respondents](image)

**Figure 1: Gender of the respondents**

Results in figure 4.1 show that 54% of the employees are males while only 46% are females. This implies that majority of people who works in Deposit Taking Sacco’s are males. This agrees with a study by Ellis, Cutura, Dione, Gillson, Manuel & Thongori (2007) that in spite of women being major actors in Kenya’s economy, and notably in agriculture and the informal business sector, men dominate in the formal sector citing the ratio of men to women in formal sector as 74%:26%. Other studies that have identified male domination in the formal and informal sectors include Gakure (2001) and Gakure (2003).

4.2.2 Age of the respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their age. Figure 2 shows the results.
Figure 2: Age of respondents

Results in figure 2 show that 36% of employees in Deposit Taking Sacco’s are aged between 26-35 years, 30% of the employees are aged between 18-25 years, 17% have their age between 35-44 years and 14% are between 45-55 years while only 3% are aged above 55 years. This indicates that majority of the people who work in Deposit Taking Sacco’s are young. According to the Population Situation Analysis Report for Kenya (2014) the trend of population growth for persons aged 24-34 years has increased from about 12% in 1999 to nearly 15% in the year 2009. Therefore the finding of this study reflects the current trend of the Kenya population indices.

4.2.3 Length of service

The respondents were asked to indicate the duration they have worked in the organization. Results are presented in Figure 3.
Results in Figure 3 show that 42% of the respondents had worked in the Deposit Taking Sacco for less than 2 years, 17% had worked in the Deposit Taking Sacco for 2-5 years, and 24% had worked in the Deposit Taking Sacco for 6-10 years while 17% had worked in the Sacco for above 11 years. This implies that majority of the respondents had not worked in the organization for a long period. This finding is inconsistent with that of Ngui (2014) who found out that 65% of the respondents have worked in the sector for over five years, a period considered long enough for an employee to understand the operations of their respective duties. This finding is consistent with that of Randoy et al, (2006) who found out that one’s experience depends on the number of years of service in the sector involved. It is assumed that the longer one worked in an organization, the more they understand the organization and hence the higher the ability to articulate issues pertaining to the organization (Afande, 2013).

4.2.4 Level of education
The respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of education. Figure 4 shows the results.

Results in Figure 4 show that 7% of the respondents had their highest level of education being masters level, 66% of the respondents had their highest level of education being degree level, 24% of the respondents had their highest level of education being diploma level while only 3% had their highest level of education being secondary level. This implies that the employees working in the Deposit Taking Sacco are skilled for the job. In addition, regarding to this study, it means that the respondents were able to read the questionnaire on their own and thus better response achieved. This finding is inconsistent with that of Adegoroye, Oladejo & Moruf, (2012) who found out that firm performance depends on academic qualification.

4.2.5 Cadre
The respondents were asked to indicate their current cadre in the Sacco. Figure 5 shows the results.
Figure 5: cadres

The results in figure 5 show that 55% of the employees are at the entry level of job position 19% are middle level employees, 18% are managers or supervisors, 5% are support staffs while 3% are top managers. This indicates that most of the people in DTS in Kenya have not been trained enough to handle management positions.


The first objective of the study was to establish the influence of delegation of Responsibilities on Innovation Performance of Deposit Taking Sacco’s in Kenya

4.3.1 Reliability Results for Delegation of Responsibility

The reliability of an instrument refers to its ability to produce consistent and stable measurements. Bagozzi (1994) explains that reliability can be seen from two sides: reliability (the extent of accuracy) and unreliability (the extent of inaccuracy). The most common reliability coefficient is Cronbach’s alpha which estimates internal consistency by determining how all items on a test relate to all other items and to the total test-internal coherence of data. The reliability is expressed as a coefficient between 0 and 1.00. The higher the coefficient, the more reliable is the test. The cronbach alpha was calculated in a bid to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. This was done by subjecting twenty two questionnaires to randomly selected respondents. Results are presented in table 2.

Table 2: Reliability coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the reliability results. delegation was reliable since the cronbach alpha was above 0.7 which was used as a cut-off of reliability for the study. Therefore the internal consistency
reliability of the measure was excellent. This indicates that the data was reliable since a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient value of 0.794 was obtained on the research variables. This was above 0.70 and an alpha coefficient higher than 0.70 signifies that the gathered data has a relatively high internal consistency and could be generalized to reflect the respondents’ opinions on the study problem.

4.3.2 Descriptive Statistics

The respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement on the statements on delegation of responsibility. Results are presented in Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees are given task to pursue in their own way</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually agreed upon results and performance standards for delegated tasks are established</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are encouraged to take active roles in defining, implementing and communicating progress on tasks.</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are trusted with completion of whole tasks whenever possible.</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delegating authority takes time to explain the relevance of delegated tasks to department or organizational goals.</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employees are given necessary authority to accomplish tasks. 13.4% 30.5% 7.9% 23.3% 25.0% 3.16 1.43
Employees are allowed access to all resources to perform delegated tasks. 15.6% 25.3% 3.1% 33.0% 22.9% 3.22 1.44

Average 3.41 1.25

Results in table 3 revealed that majority of the respondents who were 68.4% (58.0%+10.4%) agreed that employees are given task to pursue in their own way. 68.2% agreed that mutually agreed upon results and performance standards for delegated tasks are established. The results also revealed that majority of the respondents who were 68.9% agreed that employees are encouraged to take active roles in defining, implementing and communicating progress on tasks. 52.1% agreed that employees are trusted with completion of whole tasks whenever possible.

Further 54.5% agreed that the delegating authority takes time to explain the relevance of delegated tasks to department or organizational goals. 48.3% agreed that employees are given necessary authority to accomplish tasks. The results also revealed that 55.9% agreed that employees are allowed access to all resources to perform delegated tasks. Using a five point scale likert mean, the overall mean of the responses was 3.41 which indicates that majority of the respondents agreed to the statement of the questionnaire. Additionally, the standard deviation of 1.25 indicates that the responses were varied. The results herein imply that delegation of responsibilities influence innovation performance.

4.3.3 Correlation Analysis
Correlation analysis was conducted between delegation of responsibility (independent variable) and innovation performance (dependent variable). Results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovation performance</th>
<th>Delegation of Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation performance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.396**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Results in Table 4 indicated that there was a positive and a significant association between delegation of responsibilities and Innovation performance (r=0.396, p=0.000). An employer
cannot evade his responsibility related to organizational activities despite of Responsibility isn’t able to be authorized (AL-Shrqui, 2012). The right of dispose and take decisions in a specified range extent required to accomplish certain tasks. Dent has entrusted with certain administrative powers for some of aides who trust them and delegated authorities that enable them to act for the performance of these terms of reference efficiently and effectively (Hashim, 2011). It also means that the manager determines tasks that have to be implemented by one of his employees and given necessary authority to do this work. In this case employer is still responsible on decision-taking, issuing rules, instructions and regulations.

4.3.4 Regression Analysis

The results presented in table 5 present the fitness of model used of the regression model in explaining the study phenomena. Delegation of responsibilities was found to be satisfactory variable in explaining innovation performance. This is supported by coefficient of determination also known as the R square of 15.7%. This means that delegation of responsibilities explain 15.7% of the variations in the dependent variable which is innovation performance.

Table 5: Model Fitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of the Estimate</td>
<td>0.66755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In statistics significance testing the p-value indicates the level of relation of the independent variable to the dependent variable. If the significance number found is less than the critical value also known as the probability value (p) which is statistically set at 0.05, then the conclusion would be that the model is significant in explaining the relationship; else the model would be regarded as non-significant.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>24.317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.317</td>
<td>54.568</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>131.014</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155.331</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 provides the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant. Further, the results imply that the independent variable is a good predictor of innovation performance. This was supported by an F statistic of 54.568 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level.

Regression of coefficient results is presented in Table 7.
Table 7: Regression of Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>10.949</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of Responsibilities</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>7.387</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression of coefficients showed that delegation of Responsibilities and innovation performance were related ($r=0.283$, $p=0.000$). Delegation is considered vital to staff development as it provides subordinates with new experiences at a measured pace suited to their abilities and ambitions (Tannenbaum, 2008). A manager might delegate authority to a supervisor so that he/she can take some decisions, direct the work of others and give orders. Delegation always entails the subordinates becoming accountable to their superiors for the performance of the tasks assigned to them. Results in table 7 shows that delegation of responsibilities and innovation performance are positively related and significant.

Thus, the model for the study is:

Innovation performance = 1.432 + 0.283 X

Where,

$X =$ Delegation of Responsibilities

4.3.5 Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis was tested by using the ordinary least square regression. The acceptance/rejection criteria was that, if the p value is greater than 0.05, the Ho is not rejected but if it’s less than 0.05, the Ho fails to be accepted. The null hypothesis was that delegation of responsibilities does not have a significant relationship with innovation performance. The alternative hypothesis was that delegation of responsibilities had a significant relationship with innovation performance.

Results in Table 4.6 above show that the calculated $f$-statistic of 54.568 was higher than the tabulated/critical $f$ statistic ($F_{\alpha} = 0.05$). The findings were further supported by a p-value of 0.000. This indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected hence delegation of responsibilities had a significant relationship with innovation performance.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the study findings, the study concluded that most of the DTS in Kenya delegate responsibilities to their employees to pursue them in their own way and are allowed access to all resources to perform delegated tasks. The manager determines tasks that have to be implemented by one of his employees and is given necessary authority to do this work. In this case employer is still responsible on decision-making, issuing rules, instructions and regulations. Employees who are involved in decision making subsequently are better equipped to implement such decisions. Employees may also perceive their managers as valuing their contribution or that the managers are recognizing that employees are intelligent. This can lead to employee satisfaction and subsequently greater productivity.
From the regression results the study concluded that delegation of responsibilities has a positive and significant effect on innovation performance.

5.2 Recommendations
Following the study results, it was recommended that Deposit Taking Sacco’s in Kenya should involve the employees in decision making without seeking prior approval from the manager. This will make them perceive their managers are valuing their contribution or that the managers are recognizing that they are intelligent, which will can lead to employee satisfaction and subsequently greater productivity
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